18/1 F
(L.R)

File No. 18/1879
Sh. 1-8

Sub:- Complaint against the godowns
Malasagar Haskote Taluk
on account of the arrears
of Jodi.

G. R. S. IX-5]

*Previous references.* 1879

191

( L.R. )

*Later references.*

L.R. File No. 187-1879

Serial Nos. 1—8

In Complete

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

---

*Serial Nos.* 1—8

Major Part B for

---

SUBJECT.

Complaint against the godars Dharangaon ~~Harda~~ Taluk on account of the arrears of Jodi

---

W D 89—GPE—50,000—24-7-16

5915

C(H) Sl. No. 26]

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

---

General and Revenue Secretariat.

---

Requisition for papers.

Section Sec

A

B

Filed

Deposit No.

File No. 20 - 41 X

Serial No. 2

To be put up with Diary No. 208 of 1942.

Signature [illegible]

Branch

Section Sec

Date 23/5/42

WD 0380—GPB—1,000 books of 100 leaves each—8-10-42

18 79.80 - (1)

*From*

*To*

The Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore Dist.

Dated. 29.

Despatched 29 } December 1879.

Received 1 Jan 80.

**Enclosures No.** 77 in Petition packet.

*General No.* 5050

No. P.S. 78

(Petition ~~matter~~).
Acknowledge -
Transmit - 77 enclosures -

In forwarding petition
of ~~the~~ Ranganna dated the
~~sented~~ by Ramanna, son of
Nagappah, Inhabitant of ~~Kaveri~~
~~Bangalore~~ Ulsoor Village
~~Taluq~~ in the Hoscotta Taluq,
for disposal, with reference to
Proceedings No 358/621 of 11 Oct 79
observes that the subject
seems to require reconsidera-
tion in order to obviate
hardship to the parties
concerned. The Dep Commr
is requested to ascertain the

of the Future Trading A

to state how the village beh

of the individual shareholder

who has omitted to pay up h

Deed could be done to

under sale or how the Deed

could be requisitioned and ob

to see any documents sh

how the deed was originally

obtained by private agre

ment of the parties, prior to

the intervention of the Inum

Commissioners and the remain

Whitehall Yard and Arran

now due by the several share

holders —

"By order

Revenue Secretary

4-(3)

1882.

From Mcdy. Commissioner Faizabad Dist.

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
Revenue ~~General Department~~.

Dated 2 Feby

Despatched 3 February

Received 3 do

ENCLOSURES NO 2 pieces

General No. 547 } 187 —7 Ja Kepers
No. 547

Report on petition from Ramnath, son of Rajdhar, Jodhar of Kalinjpur Patti illaqa wa Tahsil Sultanpur.

3.3.82

Section
File No 180 1877
Serial No 2

Sultanpur petition dated the following arrangement after what has been made regarding the engagement of Jodi—

Petitioner Pattidar
Bhagaffar — to hold
Daleipur, Recorded
Brown & Hindu Rajput
on Jog as per agmt — 6 3 2 2
Deoki Nandan — Tilak
Sheikh Nadir Hussain & Brij
Jonigaon — 4 7 1 1
Total as per agmt 11 6 3 3
of Sultanpur

Mug 6 0 3 2

Report on petition from Ramnath, son of Rajdhar, Jodhar of Kalinjpur Patti illaqa wa Tahsil Sultanpur.

3. 3. 82

Bhagaffar Tilak 2 1 1 1
Daleipur Recorded
Brown & Hindu Rajput
on Jog as per agmt 6 3 2 2
Deoki Nandan Tilak
Sheikh Nadir Hussain & Brij
Jonigaon 4 7 1 1
Total as per agmt 11 6 3 3
of Sultanpur

Tahsil Sultanpur 35
1879 + 6382 1916
249

Tahsil Sultanpur 35
1879 + 6382 1916
249

1-2-82 Bhaiya No 1794
Tahsil Sultanpur

T.J.O

4/3

(5)

Rec'd 5/7
Indp. 2 files

To the Commissioner of Police
Bangalore District

2/129 6th February 1884 Camp Cantonment

To

The Secretary to the
Chief Commissioner
of Mysore
Revenue Department

Sir,

In reply to your Memo No. 5787/598 dated 29th December last, forwarding for report petition presented by Ramaiah, Son of Nagaya, Patelar of Dalidigere and other villagers in the Hoskote Taluk, praying the Government to state, that if fish is given on each village separately as was formerly advocated by the Excise Superintendent in his No. 33 dated 15th June 1883, permission will be given, I have the honor to report that the Chief Commissioner's Proceedings No. 5387/249 of 31st July 1883 regarding the issue

year it would then be easy to bring under sale the particular village for which pay remains unpaid. And the Petitioner and others interested, object to the division of pay in the proportions suggested by the Asam Superintendent, and state that it must be agreed according to the terms of the partition deed effected by them in the year "Ramadiha" (1853/54).

2. To avoid all disputes, the best course that recommends itself to me is to make arrangements with the Survey Superintendent for the separate valuation of the villages and a fresh distribution of pay made.

3. With regard to the amounts of their respective quotas of pay, both to Government, Private Persons Settlement, Poramik's Establishment

goes to show that he is not in possession of any details, but on the other hand the reference, produced by the Petitioner of the Partition deed, Local Cess Cases and the Taluk C. Accounts of 1873/74, (all filed in the Canara papers submitted), point to the existence of the financial arrangement referred in para 3 of the Cham Superintendent's letter above quoted.

4. The Complainant further alleges in proof of his allegation, that when Gokarnath was under Government Management for the liquidation of arrears of the Ch Rangacharlu of the Salem District, due by Ramnath Patter, Executor, the amount of Judy, kept for Magane Government was entirely with their said financial arrangement. In fact in referring to the C. Cutcha accounts for 1873-74 the

Revenue of Gaddalandi Village, which
is Peshwa's Sole Village out of the
5, would appear to have been
Rs: 6511-5-5 thereby indicating
that the private arrangement
entered into between the parties
in 1853/54 was not to prejudice
as at first sight it appears to be,
especially when the Inam Enjoyment
Terms only affected Rs: 216-3-0
to Gaddalandi.

5. I therefore recommend for the
present, and until the Survey
Department can equitably ap-
portion the total Jodi amount
recoverable villages, separately, the
the amount of Rupees 471-4-4 as
per the family arrangement of
1853-54, be taken as the declared
Jodi payable at present on Gaddalandi
Subject to revision by the Survey
Department, and on their clear

understanding in the sale if necessary in liquidation of the amount due by the Parish Council.

6 The Court will prevent all Villages being sold and may order Permit to pay upon hearing that the defaulting will not involve the Co-Sharers in the trouble and difficulty of a joint sale of all Villages.

7 Even if Parish does pay up and thus preventing the sale, Court will still have discretion to appoint the Sale on such Village Separately as and to assist if any revenue sale in case of future default. And this appears the more necessary as fractions in fractions

appointments for sale are not entitled to bidders in many cases, and which would affect the value at a Revenue Sale, and which would not be the case if the said amounts were forfeited by a skilled and competent Department, and which amount would be readily accepted by intending purchasers in the case of their bids.

8 This article would not prevent from entering into agreements between the parties themselves, and would only come into play when Government was compelled to sell in order to realize its claims

9 The amount of costs and charges by Magistrate and Revenue to

(11)

respectively, on the basis of the

private agreement No. 3513-57

of Rs. 1203-4-- and Rs. 402-8-- respectively.

10 The executors of the deceased

have duly discharged the duties

to gether with the file of correspondence

consisting of 1 Sheet.

Assistant Engineer, Gr. II Class.

Thane the 5th October 1957

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Sd/-

Dy: Commissioner

Bandra Division

Read:- (13)

Letter from the Deputy Commissioner Tanjore District, No. 56, dated the 25th February 1880, reporting upon a petition from Ramanuah, son of Nagapah, Poliadar of Dalavagoe and other inhabitants of villages in the Kootcha Taluk complaining of the Dy. Commissioner's order for the sale of all the villages on account of the arrears of Sist due by some of the individuals.

Order thereon.

Ct. No. 66 C. of 21 to 24

Memorandum.

Received No. 879

No. 3

Serial No.

Amongst the five villages under notice originally formed Inam grant, it is clear to the advantage of the Zamindars and of the Ryots to have the Sist apportioned on each of the villages upon the basis of a survey valuation, which can be made at the instance of the Zamindars, nor that the holding has become liable to attachment

in consequence of
the non-payment of
Jodi. The Survey Supt.
is accordingly requested
to adopt measures at
once for the survey
& and valuation
of the villages. Meanwhile,
it might ~~be~~ reading necessary
hereby to bring all
the villages under
attachment. It
~~and~~ would suffice
to attach and bring
under Govt. management
the villages of such of
the shareholders only
as have failed to pay
up their share of
the Jodi, in accordance
with the Institution deed
entered into by the

(15)

family. But it is
to be clearly understood
that this temporary
arrangement is not
to affect the liability
of the entire holding
for the arrears of Jodi
which may eventually
remain unliquidated
upon such arrangements
as the Govt. may be
pleased to sanction
upon the results of
the Survey valuation.

Yrs
Revd Seely.

To. The Dy. Commr
Bangalore Dt.
thro. the Tehsildar
Kapicio Subdy Inspr
& Superintendent
of Revenue Survey.

(16)

R. 1880

Nº 11 Sq. Lennox y 11a

Passage dans Quai

Suff. Pas. Lennox

Q. 12 Zurich

Insp 13

Rue { 11 Ave Wagram
entre 11a
Boccador. Avenue
Pas-de-Calais

No 6610-19

P 924

Passage aérien en ar-
chitecture pour relier les
11es Bonjeaux aux Lennox
en deux directions (Voir plan joint)
Villejuif et Dalkeyne avec 11 autres
villejuif 11a Vitre 11a Calais

(17)

Rev 1880. [illegible] 190

From The Supt. Mysore Railway

To The
Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
Rev. ~~General~~ Department.

Dated } Bangalore
Despatched } 11th December 1880
Received 11/12

ENCLOSURES NO/

General No. 954 } 1880
No.

With reference to Chief Commissioner's Order No. 6618-19 P. 724 dated 12th March last, has the honor to submit herewith a statement showing the Survey area and valuation of the 5 villages therein specified, and to state that a similar statement has also been forwarded, this day, to the Superintendent of Settlements in Mysore.

J B Grant
Supt. Mysore Railway

11.12.80 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] have sent us copy of the Valuation [illegible] [illegible] probably with the view of [illegible] the [illegible] on each village. The [illegible] [illegible] the result of his [illegible] [illegible] as regards the future [illegible] with regard to [illegible] of the 3 villages

[illegible]

Section [illegible]
F. No. 18 | 1879
Serial No. 4

Statement showing the Primary Agri

| Sl. No. | Village | Khasra No. | Name of cultivators | Clay soil | | Rice | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Area | Yield = maund | Area | Yield = maund |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | Kanakpur | | Vishwambhar Das | 2.13 | 21.0 | 0.5 | 2.5 |
| | | 2 | Gopichand Gupta | 2.32 | 23.0 | 0.8 | 4.0 |
| | | 3 | Ram Lubhaya | 2.00 | 20.0 | 0.6 | 3.0 |
| | | 4 | Others | 2.10 | 21.0 | 0.4 | 2.0 |
| | | 5 | Pradhan = Pura | 1.9 | 19.0 | 0.5 | 0.9 |

Primary Agricultural Co-operative Society Ltd.

— annual [illegible] of [illegible] —

villages.

| Guinbus | | Cimetière [illegible] village situé [illegible] | | Total | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mètres | Mètres carrés | Mètres | Mètres carrés | Mètres | Mètres carrés | |
| 2 | 5 | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | |
| [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | |
| [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | |
| [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | |
| [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | |
| | | | | | 3284 | |
| | | | | Somme [illegible] | [illegible] | |

[illegible]

au

[illegible]

[illegible]

(23)

18

Read:-

C/f Com[r] Jno No. 5613/724 dated the 12th March 1880.

Docket from the Survey Supdt No 952 dt 11th Decr 80. submitting as called for a statement showing the Survey valuation of the Dalvaagere and four other Jodi villages in the Hosdrug Taluk.

No 179

Rs. 5305-6-4 / 15-3 / 07.9.3-1 (Decr/80.)

With reference to the above, the Asstt Supdt is requested to ~~furnish~~ submit proposals for redistributing the Jodi and the Quit Rent chargeable on each of the villages referred to - The D[r] Com[r] of Bangalore should report whether the ~~village Accounts~~ ~~will be changed~~ arrears due for these villages still remain unliquidated

By Revenue

C. Receipt & Issue Settlement.
" Dte & Com[r] Bangalore

9 1882

To 17

The Siam Superintendent

" Dy Comm. Bangkok

Dated 15th December

Desp

No 5385-

P. 934

Regrets the unsuccessful
efforts made for the arrest
the Joaï and Suit and charge
with Embezzlement
also requests that a Police
Officer may be sent to Bangkok

21 (25)

No. C 187 No 5261

1894

From The Chief Commissioner

Bangalore Distt.

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,

Ramna General Department.

Dated

Despatched 27th December 1890

Received 1890 330 -

ENCLOSURES NO.

General No. } 187 —7
R No. 5880

Chief Commissioners Proceedings

No 5305-6/A934 of the 15

Instant.

---

Adverting to the concluding portion of the above, I have the honor to state that from the list attached to urzee No 1017 dated 12th December 1890 from the Amildar of Hoskote, it appears that arrears as per margin are still outstanding on Balasapore and four others

Section K A

Date 18.4.1891

Serial No

No 2039-7-2 from the Asst Commr to Bangalore

28-2-8 for January

2067-2-10

Total Rs 30-10-10

(General Serial No. 31.)

1881.

From
The Superintendent
Salem Settlt.

To

Dated 3 January 1881
Despatched
Received 5/1

Enclosures No.

General No. 99.
No.

Draws attention to his letter No 33 dy 16/6/76 in which the Jodi and Quit-rent chargeable on Dalisi-gere & 20 villages have been proportioned -

6-1-81

(29)

Trans Settlement Office

No. 11

Bangalore, 3rd January 1881.

To,

The Secretary to the Chief Commissioner,

Revenue Department.

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of the Chief Commissioner's Proceedings No. 1503-6/934 of the 3rd instant, I have the honor to draw your attention to my letter No. 35 dated 5th Jan 1876, in which the said and Asst Superintendent on each of the villages, appointed to, have been forwarded. That certificates having been granted, vide Chief Commissioner's Proceedings No. 8387/Rev. 249 dated 17th November 1876, a title deed for the whole grant, consisting of 5 villages, viz Dadagiri, Siddanahalli, Hiriur, Gowdahalli pura, and Kavendanapura, has been issued in March 1877.

2. I am only to repeat that the so-called "Gautavar system" is a hereditary land not applicable to the Coorg province and finding, when inspecting, a Land-tax, with the annual object of information each Canara land causing it to become

alienable

+ Land Revenue Law not to be in force 30-12-80

alienable property, and are liable
to give a separate title for each Lien.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servt

Chapin Lien Claimant

(31) 24

*Proceedings of the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, Department of Revenue, Agriculture and Commerce, 17th November 1876.*

of Nagappa and village No. 4 to that of Venkatachalaiya. It was however agreed that Venkatachalaiya should pay Rs. 471—4—4 towards the jodi, while the balance of Rs. 696—2—2 was to be paid by Nagappa. This arrangement was continued up to the inam settlement when the jodi was apportioned by the Assistant Superintendent as shewn in the margin. The result is that the individual who was enjoying village No. 4 has now to pay only Rs. 206—3—8; whereas, according to the agreement of 1853—54, he had to pay Rs. 471—4—4.

| | Villages. | Division amount of jodi hitherto paid. |
|---|---|---|
| | | Rs. P. |
| Ramanna (Appellant) ... | Dalasagere ... | 424 10 |
| | Siddanhalli ... | 430 11 |
| | Meduru ... | 89 9 |
| | Venkatapura ... | 16 4 |
| | Total..... | 961 10 |
| Púrnaiya (Respondent) ... | Geddalhalli ... | 206 8 |
| | Grand Total..... | 1,167 6 |

2. The Inam Superintendent confirmed the Assistant's settlement, observing that the Inam Department cannot recognize the private agreement entered into between the parties, but can only apportion the jodi and the quit-rent to each village, and referred the parties to the civil courts for adjustment of their differences.

3. In submitting the Proceedings to this Office, Major Cole requests permission to deviate from the existing practice so far as to issue separate title deeds for each of the villages.

4. The Chief Commissioner observes that the appeal preferred in this case against the proceedings of the Superintendent of Inam Settlement could have been presented to the Survey and Inam Commissioner, whose opinion therefore is requested on the two points which remain to be determined in this case, *viz.* (1) whether the Superintendent of Inam Settlements was right in apportioning the quit-rent according to the beriz of each village notwithstanding that the five villages were included in one grant, and (2) whether under the circumstances of the case sparate title deeds may be issued as suggested by Major Cole.——To the Inam Commissioner in Mysore with Proceedings and appeal petitions.

---

From the Survey and Settlement Commissioner, Mysore, To the Officiating Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, No. 1364, dated Poona, 21st October 1876.

With reference to Chief Commissioner's letter No. 6320—1074 of the 25th ultimo, I have the honor to state my opinion as follows:—

2. The five villages referred to were originally one grant to one person on a jodi consisting of one lump sum of Rs. 1,167—6—0. After the death of the original grantee, the sons Nagappa and Venkatachalaiya made a division of these villages, the first taking four villages and the other one village, and by mutual agreement arranged between themselves that the first named son should pay Rs. 696-2-2 as his jodi on the four villages he took, and the second named Rs. 471—4—4 on the one village falling to his share. This appears to have been a private agreement and is not stated to have received any sanction from competent authority; but the respective quotas of jodi appear to have been paid, and so long as the Government thus received its jus dues in full, there was no call for interference.

3. But at the inam settlement a fresh apportionment of the jodi was made by the Inam Assistant to the effect that Venkatachalaiya instead of paying Rs. 471—4—4 should in future pay only Rs. 206—3—8, and Nagappa instead of paying Rs. 696—2—2 was to pay Rs. 961—2—10; the Inam Superintendent in confirming this decision observing that the private agreement was not recognizable by the Inam Department, which had only to apportion the jodi and quit-rent to each village, and referred the parties to the civil court for adjustment of thir differences.

4. In my opinion the Inam Department had most decidedly no business whatever to treat these five villages as five separate cases or otherwise than as one indivisible grant, bound together as the grant of the villages was by a comprehensive jodi on the whole in a lump, and that the Inam Department further had no call to interfere with or deal with the apportionment of the jodi on each village which might and in this case did prove a serious interference with the rights of individuals, probably forcing them into litigation which would never have arisen but for this act of the Inam Department. In my view the functions of the Inam Department are confined to determining not between man and man, as in effect if their decision was good they did in this case, but merely to determine what grants of alienations of revenue are good and recognized by Government. Had these villages been confirmed as originally granted as one inam on one lump jod to the representative of the original grantee, the decision would in my opinion have been the only right one and one which in itself could have given rise to no insecurity of tenure or possibility of litigation. The inam having thus been recognized as valid those entitle to share in it would have settled their shares and quotas of jodi by mutual agreement, if they had not already done so as in this case, and in case of future difference would resort to the civil court.

2 (32)

*Proceedings of the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, Department of Revenue, Agriculture and Commerce, 1th November 1876.*

From the Superintendent of Inam Settlements, To the Sec. Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, General Department, No. 33, dated Bangalore, 15th June 1876.

I have the honor to submit the following report on the petition of Ramanna, Jodidar of Dalasahalli in the Hoskote Taluk, asalled for in your official memo No. 2417—G. 393 of the 9th instant.

*Herewith returned.

2. The five villages noted below were registered in the names of Nagappa, father of the petitioner, and of Púrnaiya.

| | Village. | Description. | Extent. | Peshkash. | Jari or dest. | Jodi. | Quit-rent. | R. sheet No. | Case No. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | K. K. P | Rs. A. P. | | Rs. A. P. | Rs. A. P. | | |
| A. | 1. Dalasagere (Asali) ... | Dry & wet. | 91-10- 5¾ | 40- 3-5 | | 124-11-10 | 130-0-0 | 496 and 629 | 5 |
| B. | 2. Siddanhalli ... | Do | 33-13-12¼ | 17-11-0 | | 130- 9-11 | 136-0-0 | 625 | 6 |
| C. | 3. Medura ... | Do | 11- 1- 8¼ | 9- 2-6 | | 89- 3- 9 | 90-0-0 | 519 | 3 |
| D. | 4. Geddalhallipura ... | Do | 29-19-11¼ | 22-13-8 | | 206- 3- 3 | 209-0-0 | 520 | 3 |
| E. | 5. Hosvenkatpura ... | Do | 7- 4- 0 | [illegible] 3-9 | | 16- 9- 4 | 17-0-0 | 627 | 1 |
| | (All Jodi villages) | Total..... | 173- 9- 5¾ | 1[illegible]-2-4 | Jari. | 1,167- 6- 6 | 1,182-0-0 | | |

3. These five villages are held under one grant. [illegible]47 the parties divided, and, by the deed of partition, No. 4 village, Geddalhallipura, fell to the sh[illegible] of Púrnaiya's father, and the other 4 to Nagappa. The proportion of jodi on No. 4 village would [illegible] Rs. 206—3—3, but by the deed of partition it was agreed that Purnaiya's father should pay Rs. 4[illegible]—4—4 to the Government out of the total jodi of Rs. 1,167—6—6 on the five villages.

4. This arrangement was accepted by the Revenue [illegible]thorities at the time; but, during the inam settlement, Púrnaiya appealed to me to apportion the jo[illegible]n each village, and it was manifest that a jodi of Rs. 471—4—4 could not be imposed on a village [illegible]essed only at Rs. 226—13—8, in order to carry out the terms of a private agreement. The true va[illegible] of the village would be known after its survey, when the final quit-rent would be imposed, and it w[illegible] pointed out to the petitioner that any loss he might sustain, by his branch of the family having no[illegible] pay more of the Government demand than had been decided on when they had divided off, would be [illegible]coverable through the civil courts, or they could re-adjust the division they had formerly arrived at.

5. The question of the issue of a separate title deed for No. 4 village to Púrnaiya has arisen. Under the former rules separate title-deeds were issued [illegible] alienees and legally divided members of a family, but in the grantvar correspondence only recognized alienees are declared to be entitled to separate title deeds, and divided members of a family would appear to have been overlooked. In any case I am of opinion that each whole inam village should have its own separate and distinct title for the future, and that a number of whole inam villages should not be clubbed into one title-deed, without any regard to present possession and enjoyment, merely because they had been originally granted in one sannad to the founder of the family.

---

Appeal petition No. 72, dated 10th April 1876, from Ramanna, Jodidar of Dalasahalli in the Hoskote Taluk and counter petition No. 1375, dated 4th August 1876, from his cousin Púrnaiya.

---

No. 6320—G. 1074, dated 25th September 1876.

Order thereon.—The facts of this case are briefly thes[illegible]. The five villages named in the margin* were originally granted to one Nandagudi Venkatkrishnaiya and included in one sannad, the jodi payable to Government, which was fixed in a lump sum of 500 pagodas, being, after certain deductions, reduced to Pagodas 401—F. 2—V. 15 or Rs. 1,167—6—6. After the death of the original grantee, his sons Nagappa and Venkatachalaiya mutually effected a division of the family property in 1853—54, when villages Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 5 fell to the share

*1. Dalasagere.
2. Siddanhalli.
3. Medura.
4. Geddalhalli.
5. Venkatapura.

5. The above opinion is given quite irrespective of Chief Commissioner's order No. 811—152, dated 30th April 1874, and would have been given to the effect had that order never been given; these cases were, it appears, decided on in 1874 and and after the Chief Commissioner's orders No. 811—152, dated 30th April 1874, had come into tion, and therefore, as it appears to me, not only in opposition to those orders but also to that whic right and reasonable in itself.

6. With respect to the second question, as to w r a separate title deed may be issued for each village, my opinion is as follows.

7. The five villages are held conjointly for a jod able in one sum without apportionment on each village. There is neither authority, reason, or n er means for apportioning the jodi on each village separately with a due regard to its value, for th ent beriz is no guide to the present value. Without an apportionment of the jodi separate title dee an impossibility, for with a separate deed a separate declaration of liability to a certain amount of j a necessity. Moreover by an apportionment on such uncertain data one village might easily ed much above its full "kandayam" value, and others under their proper quota of jodi; the ove village might be resigned, the under rated ones being held on by other sharers, evidently to the lo Government. If the whole five villages were continued as one grant, they would be as hitherto joi and severally liable to Government for the whole lump jodi due to Government, and let private ar ments and sub-divisions occur as they might, the Government would always be secure of receiving th l jodi due.

8. On this point also my opinion is given quite pective of the Chief Commissioner's orders No. 811—152, dated 30th April 1874, on what appears to be the only justifiable settlement of a case involving facts as represented. The Chief Com oner's order above quoted would directly interdict the issue of separate title deeds even had thes ges not been tied together by the bond of a lump jodi payment.

9. From the above it may be understood that in opinion the five villages should be treated as one grant subject to the payment of a fixed lump j that the quit-rent should also be fixed in one sum on the whole five villages, leaving the sharer le their respective quotas among themselves, and that one title deed only should be issued harers in the inam being free to obtain an authenticated copy of the one title deed issued.

---

No. 8387—Rev. 249, dated Ban , 17th November 1876.

Order thereon.—The Chief Commission lly concurs in the views expressed by the Hon'ble Colonel Anderson in his letter abo quoted. The five villages in question having been granted by His Highness the lat haraja under one sannad, for a jodi expressed in a lump sum of 500 pagodas, and Government having no cognizance of the private agreement between the parties, it d have been more in accordance with the present grantvar system and the instru s conveyed in this Office Proceedings No. 811—152, dated 30th April 1874, if the deed was issued collectively, leaving the parties to determine their respective rights uit.

2. The settlement already made by the m Department, where by the jodi was apportioned and quit-rent charged separat for each village, is quashed, and the Inam Superintendent is requested to revise th ttlement in accordance with the views expressed by the Inam Commissioner.

3. The papers received with the Inam erintendent's docket No. 52, dated 7th August 1876, are herewith returned.

T. CLARKE,
*Offg. Secretary.*

---

To—The Survey and Inam Commissioner.
„ Superintendent of Inam Settlements.

1876.

# GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

## REVENUE.

*To*

THE INAM COMMISSIONER.
„ SUPT. OF INAM SETTLEMENTS.

*Dated November 17th.*

*Despatched*

*Received*

No. 8387.
Rev. 249.

---

*Correspondence regarding the treatment of the Dalasahalli Jodi.*—Passing orders thereon.

---